

and severely beat him. He told his lawyer that he saw U.S. Marines at Kandahar "using pages of the Koran to shine their boots," and was brutalized at Guantanamo Bay by Immediate Response Force guards who videotaped themselves attacking him.

The military says the IRF squads are sent into cells to quell disturbances.

Dossari told his lawyers that he had been wrapped in Israeli and U.S. flags during interrogations—a tactic recounted in FBI allegations of abuse at Guantanamo—and said interrogators threatened to send him to countries where he would be tortured.

Dossari maintains that he is not connected to terrorism and does not hate the United States. A fellow detainee said that he saw Dossari at an al Qaeda training camp, his lawyer said.

Colangelo-Bryan is a private New York lawyer with the Center for Constitutional Rights, which represents some of the detainees. The group plans a "Fast for Justice" rally today in Washington to bring attention to the Guantanamo Bay hunger strike.

Colangelo-Bryan said Dossari has tried to commit suicide before. Prolonged solitary confinement has given him almost no contact with others and access to only a Koran and his legal papers.

"In March, he looked at me in the eye and said, 'How can I keep myself from going crazy?'" Colangelo-Bryan said.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I would like to make some general comments about our Defense bill and where we are, so I ask the chairman whether that should be in morning business?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. I thank my distinguished colleague, who is a very valued member of our committee. We are anxious this afternoon to pursue amendments. I will review at an appropriate time what we have achieved so far and what we have planned for the day. But it would be the managers' preference that as you speak to the bill, you do so in morning business because we are on a rather tight time constraint. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the chairman.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL AND IRAQ

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I believe we have a very fine Armed Services Committee. I have now been honored to serve on that committee for

a number of years. With regard to this year's authorization bill, we have had 35 hearings in the committee or subcommittee. We have undertaken to deal with complex issues facing our military. The chairman and our committee have responded repeatedly to the requests of Democratic Senators to conduct a plethora of hearings dealing with any problems they can find, such as prisoner issues and that kind of thing. We have also conducted those in the Judiciary Committee, in the Intelligence Committee, in the House committees also. We have done quite a lot, frankly, as we have gone forward.

I think it is time for us to give the highest priority, however, to assisting our men and women in uniform, men and women we have sent in harm's way to execute the policy of the United States of America—a policy that was adopted by the House of Representatives, a policy that was adopted by more than a three-fourths vote of this body. A majority of both parties voted to adopt these policies to execute force, to remove Saddam Hussein unless he complied with the U.N. resolutions, and to otherwise carry out our roles and responsibilities.

We have done that, but we need to focus on how to help those soldiers we have sent be successful in creating a good and stable and democratic government in Iraq. It is important for us, it is important for the world, and, most of all, it is important for the people there who have suffered the greatest oppression for so many years.

I think our committees have served well. I think we have worked at these issues well. We have now prepared a bill, a legislation piece, that will empower our military to be able to do their job better. I could not be more pleased than to serve under Chairman WARNER and his leadership in the committee. He works collegially with all members of the Senate in our committee to move legislation along effectively. He has worked hard to get this bill where it is today. Without strong leadership, frankly, I am not sure we would be here today.

We have passed the Defense appropriations bill, but we have not passed the Defense authorization bill. It would be unfortunate if we were not able to do so this year. Hopefully, if our colleagues will cooperate, if they have an amendment and bring it down and present it, they will be able to have all the amendments that have been promised, and we can get something done. We certainly do not need to delay or drag these matters out.

I think this issue of our involvement in Iraq needs to be recalled a bit—how we came to vote. They say—some do—there were lies that led us into this war. But all of us talked about this possible conflict for months—months. We knew it was coming. The President talked about it. We talked about it openly on the floor.

In fact, in the 1990s, when President Clinton was President, we voted and es-

tablished a policy for the United States of America. That policy was that we would effect a regime change in Iraq. And up until these hostilities occurred—for years—American and British planes, enforcing the no-fly zones to keep Saddam Hussein from oppressing the Kurds and the Shiites, flew missions over Iraq, and were fired upon, sometimes on a daily if not weekly basis.

We dropped bombs and missiles on them in retaliation, regularly, for years. In fact, we were in a state of hostility because Saddam Hussein had failed to comply with the agreements he made with the United Nations in 1991 when he was kicked out of Kuwait after he had invaded his neighbor—a peaceful, decent member of the world community.

He attacked them to seize their oil and to increase his power. We had to create a world coalition to give him a demand to remove himself from Kuwait. He refused to do so, and GEN Norman Schwarzkopf led the coalition forces that defeated his army and removed him from Kuwait. He made agreements so we would not continue marching on to Baghdad to get our hands around his neck. He made these commitments to the U.N. and agreements were reached. He did not comply with them. He was in violation of 16 different resolutions of the United Nations.

So all that was there. Also, 9/11 had occurred. And we knew he was violating the Oil-for-Food Program—a program that was set up to allow him to sell oil, which was being embargoed because of his violation of the rules and regulations of the U.N., and it allowed him to do that if the money would be utilized to take care of food and medicines for the people of Iraq because we wanted to help them.

I have been to Iraq three times. I know the chairman has been there numerous times. You can see the palaces he built with that money that was supposed to feed his people. We know he was reconstituting his military. He declared he had been the victor in that war, not the loser. It was clear he was reconstituting his military power because he desired and had not given up his fantasy ambition to dominate the Middle East.

These were the forces that were at work. These were strategic realities that occurred at that time. The Economist magazine wrote an editorial not long before we voted, and it talked about how the embargo was failing, how, in fact, the embargo was really hurting the people of Iraq more than it was hurting Saddam Hussein, but that it was falling apart; that Saddam Hussein had a systematic plan to break the embargo, and nations, such as France and others, were working behind the scenes to undermine the effect of that embargo, and that if we did not do something pretty soon, he would be unleashed again. They said the question simply is, Do we turn him loose or do

we go to war? Our vote is to go to war, said the London-based Economist magazine.

So those are the decisions we were dealing with. Every intelligence agency in the world concluded that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. I am not aware of any that did not believe he had some. Certainly, that is what the President of the United States was told. Certainly, that is what the Members of the Senate were told.

But the more troubling, deeper, strategic imperative, to deal with Saddam Hussein, was what galvanized the attention of the President and, I think, of the Senate. When I looked at my remarks from the time I had discussed my decision to support a war in Iraq, I hardly mentioned weapons of mass destruction.

It was this idea—that Saddam Hussein had not been faithful to his agreements, that he was determined to get out of those agreements, that he was determined to reconstitute his military, that he could be a threat to the region and that he could easily, and we thought he did, have weapons of mass destruction that he would use. We know he used a weapon of mass destruction, poison gas, against his own people, the Kurds. We know he used it. So it would have been unthinkable to think he had none at the time. Whatever happened to it, I don't know.

We made a commitment in this Nation to remove Saddam Hussein, and that has been done. We have had two elections in Iraq toward establishing a democratic government. For that, I am most proud and hopeful that this new election in December, which will create a new permanent government, will help further to demonstrate the confidence the Iraqi people have in that government and make attacks upon it even more difficult to sustain and defend.

I ask my colleagues to remember this one thing—it is still a dangerous place there. Our soldiers are there because we sent them. We asked them to go there to execute the policy we in the Senate voted for. We ought not do things and say things out of political anger or partisanship that are exaggerated, unfair to the President or our troops and how they conduct themselves, that puts their lives more at risk and makes their job more difficult.

I am pleased that this authorization bill came out of Chairman WARNER's committee unanimously with a bipartisan vote. As we go forward with it, we will improve the quality of our military, their effectiveness, and help execute more effectively the policies we have established.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank our distinguished colleague. He has taken an active role in a number of issues and that, together with his work on the Judiciary Committee, gives him

a special insight into the issue of detainee matters.

The distinguished ranking member has arrived. I had hoped that Senator CORNYN could speak for 15 to 20 minutes, if that is agreeable, and then following that, perhaps the Senator from Michigan and I will have some matters to address the Senate on. For the benefit of all Members, the bill is open for amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, that certainly is fine with me. I always welcome the opportunity to hear from our colleagues. I understand there are a number of amendments on the side of the Senator from Virginia that may be ready to go this afternoon. We believe we have one that will be ready at 4:30.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my distinguished colleague. I say, with a sense of modesty, that we are making good progress on the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAQ

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I thank the chairman and distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee. It is more with sadness than in anger that I rise to respond to recent allegations made by some Democrats that the Bush administration "manufactured and manipulated intelligence in order to sell the war in Iraq." War is serious business. I don't need to remind my colleagues that more than 2,000 Americans have sacrificed their lives fighting to liberate the Iraqi people, and many brave Texans are among them.

Today, Iraq represents the central front in the global war on terror. Yet we have even seen the sad occasion of having sustained 2,000 deaths of America's fighting men and women in Iraq spark an ill-advised and premature call for withdrawal of our troops by the angry antiwar left. That call has been picked up, in part, if not in whole, by some politicians seeking to capitalize on that anger. But merely venting anger without proposing alternative solutions is not the work of serious people. It is a sad commentary on our public discourse when politicians seek to use the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform to advance a political agenda.

While the critics focused on 2,000 Americans killed in action in Iraq, another important number to remember is 3,000—the number of innocent Americans killed on September 11. Is there any doubt that if we pulled out of Iraq prematurely without stabilizing security, without building the necessary infrastructure, and without allowing

Iraqis to build successful democratic institutions as they are doing, that 9/11 would be repeated over and over and over again by an enemy that would continue to target innocent civilians in pursuit of their perverse ideology? If Iraq descends into civil war or is overrun by terrorists, if Iraq becomes a place where terrorists recruit, train, and export terror with impunity, how long do the critics believe it would take until we would be hit again on our own soil?

The war on terrorism is a war we must win. The stakes are too high to use the war on terror as a political football. If there is any doubt about the enemy and their goals, all one needs to do is read the letter from Osama bin Laden's chief deputy, Zawahiri, his chief lieutenant in Iraq. Zawahiri clearly describes al-Qaida's vision of establishing an Islamic caliphate that would rule the Middle East and eventually the world. It would also, not incidentally, include the destruction of our best ally in the Middle East, the state of Israel.

Although we are making progress in Iraq, as we saw most recently during the successful referendum on the constitution, there is obviously more work that needs to be done. We know that our troops have the will to win. I am concerned that there are some here at home and even in the Senate who do not share this same resolve because they stubbornly refuse to learn the lessons of 9/11.

The latest accusation by some in the Democratic leadership, that the administration has manipulated intelligence and has exaggerated the threat, is nothing more than an effort to use the war in Iraq for political gain. That is shameful. It devalues the sacrifice our men and women are making on the battlefield every day. It places at risk everything that Americans have sacrificed on behalf of the cause of liberty here and abroad. Do the critics need to be reminded that it was a few years ago when Democrats joined Republicans in a bipartisan acknowledgment that Saddam Hussein posed a threat to the world?

In fact, it was the Senate, in 1998, that unanimously passed the Iraq Liberation Act that called for the United States to support efforts to overthrow that terrible dictator. It was President Clinton who so eloquently described the threat posed by Saddam Hussein and the consequences of inaction when he said:

The hard fact is that so long as Saddam remains in power, he threatens the well-being of his people, the peace of the region, the security of the world. The best way to end that threat once and for all is with the new Iraqi government, a government ready to live at peace with its neighbors, a government that respects the rights of its people.

President Clinton went on to say:

Heavy as they are, the costs of action must be weighed against the price of inaction. If Saddam defies the world and we fail to respond, we will face a far greater threat in the future. Saddam will strike again at his